

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-22, and 24-46 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5-6, 11, 14-16, 24-25, 34, 38-39, and 41-42 are amended. No new matter is added.

Section 112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 5, 6, 14-16, 24, 25, 34, 38, 39 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for containing asserted informalities.

Regarding the hydroxyl group in claim 1, Applicants respectfully point out that claim 1 refers to "monomers containing" hydroxyl groups. Applicants believe that the remaining aspects of this rejection are overcome with the above amendments to the claims.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 5, 6, 14-16, 24, 25, 34, 38, 39 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

Section 102 Rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5, 21, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by SU 494,409 ("SU"). This rejection is traversed.

The SU document teaches the use of a water-soluble polymer, which 1) cannot help drying and 2) is not a super-absorbent. The SAP used in accordance with the presently claimed invention is cross-linked, hence water-insoluble.

The SU document teaches a composition for treating the hide after the same has been preserved. In the SU document, the finished product is treated. The present invention treats and preserves the RAW product, and dries it (which the SU document cannot do – and has actually no need to do since it has already been dried by a preservation method or step of some sort).

The SU document teaches the use of NaCl; the present invention does not use NaCl.

The fact that the SU translation may use some inaccurate words such as "preservatives" and so on should not mislead the facts: the SU document uses a water-soluble, hence not cross-linked polymer, which cannot dry the product, uses NaCl, and works on the finished product. The invention, to the contrary, dries and preserves the RAW product so that it can later on reach the treatment step of the SU document or any other final treatment step.

The methods involving the SU and present compositions have entirely different aims, solve entirely different problems, and fail to use the same chemicals.

Although the available translation of the SU document may be confusing, an individual of ordinary skill in the art would not have been confused and would have immediately appreciated the technical facts.

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 21, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below to schedule a personal or telephone interview to discuss any remaining issues.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300 referencing Attorney Docket No. 024118-00013.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert K. Carpenter
Registration No. 34,794

Customer No. 004372
AREN'T FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

RKC/tdd